

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	. 1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/815,159 03/31/2004		03/31/2004	R. Scott Stephens	WEYE121926/25350	8194	
28624	7590	03/30/2006		EXAMINER		
		R COMPANY	CORDRAY, DENNIS R			
INTELLE	CTUAL PR	OPERTY DEPT				
P.O. BOX	9777		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
FEDERAL	WAY, W	'A 98063	1731			

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/815,159	STEPHENS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Dennis Cordray	1731	

	Dennis Cordray	1731						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 March 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	ALLOWANCE.						
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff stice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)					
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.							
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. I no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) a					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	bliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of					
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th						
AMENDMENTS								
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co 			ecause					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be		ducing or simplifying	the issues for					
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mnliant Amandmant	(DTOL 324)					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		mphant Amendment	(FTOL-324).					
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 		timely filed amendme	ent canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of					
Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:	•							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☑ Other: See Contiouation Sheet.	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper i	No(s)						
TO. KA Other. Gee Continuation Officer.								
•								

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Application No.

The Declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.131 is not considered timely because it was not submitted according to the following conditions (see MPEP 715.09):

- (A) prior to a final rejection;
- (B) before appeal in an application not having a final rejection;
- (C) after final rejection, but before or on the same date of filing an appeal, upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116(e); or
- (D) after the prosecution is closed (e.g., after a final rejection, after appeal, or after allowance) if applicant files the affidavit or other evidence with a request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 in a utility or plant application filed on or after June 8, 1995; or a continued prosecution application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) in a design application.

With regard to the subject matter of U.S. Patent Application Publication, US 2003/0208859 ("the Neogi reference") used in the prior Final Rejection, dated December 7, 2005, the reference was used only to teach that the addition of small amounts of blue colorant to improve whiteness appearance is known in papermaking. The addition of blue dye to pulp to offset yellownesss is well known in the industry and would be obvious to one skilled in the art.

The other arguments have been addressed in the previous Office Action.

Continuation of 13. Other: The rejection set forth in the prior Office Action, dated December 7, 2005, is maintained.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700